

REMARKS

Claims 1–4, 10–12, 16 and 18 are amended as shown above. Claims 5–9 and 13–15 are canceled. No claims are added. Claims 1–4, 10–12 and 16–18 remain pending. Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Objections to the Specification

The specification is objected to as consisting of more than 300 lines of code. Applicant respectfully requests that resolution of this objection be continued until such time, if any, that one or more of the present claims is allowed. If allowable subject matter is noted by the Examiner, Applicant will provide the appropriate computer program listing on a compact disc.

Objections to the Claims

Claims 1, 3–4, 7 and 9–11 are objected to because of certain informalities. Claim 9 has been canceled and the other claims objected to have been amended to resolve the objections. Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to these claims be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1–10 and 12–18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 5–9 and 13–15 have been canceled, thus rendering the rejection thereof moot. Claims 1–4, 10–12, 16 and 18 have been amended and Applicant believes said amendments overcome the Section 101 rejections. Furthermore, claim 17 depends from claim 16 and is allowable at least by virtue of that dependency. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102Claims 1–6 and 12

Claims 1–6 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0178249 A1 issued to Prabakaran et al. (hereinafter "Prabakaran"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a method for use in a computing environment. The method includes steps of: (1) "collecting settings from a first group policy object applied to a first scope of management;" (2) "collecting settings from a second group policy object applied to a second scope of management;" (3) "combining the settings into at least one markup language document according to a predefined schema;" (4) "displaying a report created from the markup language document;" and (5) "wherein only settings from configured settings are included in the displayed report."

Prabakaran does not disclose or anticipate each and every element recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference under a Section 102 analysis. The rejection of claim 1, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Claims 2–4, 10 and 12 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least by virtue of that dependency. Accordingly, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Claims 5 and 6 have been canceled, thus rendering the rejection thereof moot.

Claims 13–15

Claims 13–15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0154404 A1 issued to Beadles et al. (hereinafter "Beadles").

Claims 13–15 have been canceled, thus rendering the rejection thereof moot.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103Claims 7–9

Claims 7–9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prabakaran and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,931,447 B1 issued to Hemstreet et al. (hereinafter "Hemstreet").

Claims 7–9 have been canceled, thus rendering the rejection thereof moot.

Claim 10

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prabakaran and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,578,192 B1 issued to Boehme et al. (hereinafter "Boehme"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 10 depends from claim 1 and is allowable at least by virtue of that dependency, since the cited references – standing together or alone – do not teach or suggest each and every element recited in claim 10. Accordingly, claim 10 is allowable over the cited references and the rejection thereof should be withdrawn.

Claim 11

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prabakaran in view of Boehme, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 6,578,192 B1 of Knight et al. (hereinafter "Knight"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 11 depends from claim 10 and, ultimately, claim 1 and is allowable at least by virtue of that dependency, since the cited references – taken alone or in combination – do not teach or suggest each and every element recited in claim 10. Accordingly, claim 11 is allowable over the cited references and the rejection thereof should be withdrawn.

Claims 16–18

Claims 16–18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Beadles, in view of Prabakaran. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 16 has been amended and now recites a method that includes steps of “providing a schema that describes resultant set of policy settings” and “applying the schema to output a formatted version of the resultant set of policy settings that identifies configured settings and omits non-configured settings.”

Neither of the cited references nor a combination thereof teach or suggests the elements recited in claim 16. Accordingly, claim 16 is allowable over the cited references and the rejection thereof should be withdrawn.

Claims 17 and 18 depend from claim 16 and are allowable at least by virtue of that dependency. Accordingly, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

NOTE re Notice of Reference (PTO–892)

Applicant notes that the reference to Marl et al., US2003/0126236 listed on page 13 of the office action is not listed on the Notice of Reference Cited PTO–892.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above Application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Application Number: 10/612,759  
Attorney Docket Number: 303815.01  
Filing Date: 07/01/2003

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

By:

James R. Banowsky, Reg. No.: 37,773  
Attorney for Applicants  
Direct telephone (425) 705-3539

Date: June 20, 2006

Microsoft Corporation  
One Microsoft Way  
Redmond, WA 98052-6399

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION**  
**(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

June 20, 2006  
Date

  
Signature

Noemi Tovar  
Printed Name

Application Number: 10/612,759  
Attorney Docket Number: 303815.01  
Filing Date: 07/01/2003